

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0487

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action dated December 6, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the response to the Final Office Action dated September 22, 2005, which was faxed on November 22, 2005, has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance. In response, Applicants are filing a RCE and a Second Response to Final Office Action dated September 22, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response extended one month set to expire on January 22, 2006. The Second Response to Final Office Action is filed in place of the Response to Final Office Action faxed on November 22, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). According to the Examiner, the mating of the back bearing body with the piston must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims. In response, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to Figure 5 where it clearly shows the back bearing body "315" mated to the piston "240". Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the drawings be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 39 and 40 as being anticipated by *Simpson* '532. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 39 as being anticipated by *Clark* '891. Applicants have cancelled claims 39 and 40, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 15, 29, and 33 (and claims depending therefrom) as being obvious over *Simpson* '532 in view of *Clark* '630 and the pre-grant publication '704 to *Jackson*. The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 and 32 as being obvious over *Simpson* '532 in view of *Clark* '630 and *Jackson* '704 as applied to claims 5, 15, 30, and 35 above, and further in view of the pre-grant publication '769 to *Whang*. The

Page 7

430625_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0487

Examiner rejected claim 20 (and claims depending therefrom) as being obvious over *Simpson* '532 in view of *Clark* '630 and *Jackson* '704 as applied to the claims above, and further in view of the WIPO document '728 to *Simpson, et al.* The Examiner rejected claims 26-28 as being obvious over *Simpson* '532 in view of *Clark* '630, *Jackson* '704, and WIPO '728 as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of *Whang* '769. Applicants have cancelled claims 1-3, 5-36 and 41, thereby obviating the rejection.

New Claims

New claims 42-64 have been added to claim aspects of the present invention. Applicants submit no new matter has been added. Additionally, Applicants believe the references cited by the Examiner does not teach or disclose all the limitations in new claims 42-64. Therefore, Applicants believe new claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch
Registration No. 48,678
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants